DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 698 EA 012 827

TITLE	Toward Safer Schools in Illinois. Volume I: Report of the Task Force on School Violence and Vandalism.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State Office of Education, Springfield. Dept. of Planning, Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	16p.: For a related document, see EA 012 828.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education: *Prevention: Public Schools: *School Vandalism: *Violence
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois

ABSTRACT

This report, one of two related volumes, is the work of an Illinois task force on school violence and vandalism. It presents the task force's findings regarding the nature and extent of the problem, a summary of its major recommendations to local districts, and recommendations for state-level consideration. The report begins with an analysis of school crime, including costs, victims, and trends. Some local approaches described for dealing with school violence and vandalism include training of administrators, alternative education programs, and parental involvement. One general task force recommendation includes the sponsorship of workshops to provide information on how to handle the problems associated with violence and vandalism. (Author/LD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189698

TOWARD SAFER SCHOOLS IN ILLINOIS

Volume I: Report of the Task Force on School Violence and Vandalism

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JACK WITKOWSKY
Chairman, State Board of Education

JOSEPH M. CRONIN
State Superintendent of Education

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
ILLINOIS OFFICE OF EDUCATION

SPRINGFIELD
1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D W SCOTT

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Funded by ESEA
Section 842
State Equalization Funds

EA 012 827

2/3

JUL 2 1 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
FOREWORD		3
CHAPTER I.	THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM	5
CHAPTER II.	SUMMARY OF SOME LOCAL APPROACHES TO DEAL WITH SCHOOL VIOLENCE AND VANDALISM	9
CHAPTER III.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATE-LEVEL CONSIDERATION	12
TASK FORCE MEMBERS AND ILLINOIS OFFICE OF EDUCATION STAFF		15

FOREWORD

School violence and vandalism with their accompanying costs and loss of attention to educational matters are major concerns to the public, community agencies and educators.

Accordingly, in the summer of 1977, an Illinois Task Force on School Violence and Vandalism was formed to function as a state-level advisory group.

Entitled *Toward Safer Schools in Illinois,* the work of the task force has been printed and distributed in two volumes. The first, *The Report of the Task Force on School Violence and Vandalism* presents the task force's findings regarding the nature and extent of the problem, a summary of its major recommendations to local districts, and recommendations for state-level consideration. The second volume, *A Manual to Reduce School Violence and Vandalism,* contains more detailed and extensive recommendations to local districts, and a listing and brief description of resources which local districts can draw upon in planning and managing programs of reducing school and community violence and vandalism.

The task force had as its objectives the following:

—To examine the major studies and reports on the subject to assess the nature and extent of the problem.

—To consider means to reduce hostility toward people and property through improved educational policy and practice.

—To outline other kinds of action in Illinois to overcome the drain that school violence and vandalism have on our public resources.

—To identify means of greater interagency cooperation to combat violence and vandalism.

—To suggest possible state-level technical assistance and leadership roles for consideration by the Illinois State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Education, and the Illinois Office of Education.

—To identify some of the major resources local districts can draw upon for assistance.

—To present a report which, following IOE review, would be printed and distributed in order to create a greater awareness of the nature and extent of the problem and of approaches to lessen school violence and vandalism.

The task force members, IOE staff and I know that many of the suggestions in these two publications for local district action are already in effect in a number of schools. The suggestions should be viewed as alternatives for consideration to be applied, modified or rejected based on a local appraisal of the situation. We realize that in many districts, crime in the schools is not a major problem. But we also know that in some districts it is a greater problem than many educators are willing to acknowledge or community members realize.

If these publications stimulate people in the various school districts and communities to assess the nature and extent of crime in their schools and to take measures to alleviate violence and vandalism, then they will have achieved one of the task force's primary objectives.

Joseph M. Cronin
Illinois State Superintendent
of Education

CHAPTER ONE

The Nature and Extent of the Problem

What is School Violence and Vandalism?

This report is about crime in the public schools — offenses against property and offenses against persons. Personal theft, individual fights, threats, and attacks are the more common forms of violence in schools. Less common are gang fights and robbery.[1] Rape and murder are particularly rare occurrences in schools. Violence can be of a psychological character — for example, the fear of violence sometimes associated with initial efforts at integration.

Offenses against property include vandalism, trespassing, burglary (which involves breaking and entering), and theft of school property. Vandalism is the most costly of the property crimes involving school. Vandalism may be defined as acts which destroy, remove, deface, damage, lose, or waste school district property and/or acts which result in expenditures of staff time and district financial resources to restore acceptable conditions. Arson may be considered a form of vandalism, or categorized separately.

Other types of behavior — or better, misbehavior — of concern to teachers, administrators, students, and parents may relate to and lead to crime but do not fall within the categories of offenses against people or property. Therefore, this report does not focus on such matters as skipping or being late to class, truancy, profanity, smoking, the use of drugs and alcohol, showing off, talking back, disrespect and other ways of giving teachers a hard time, public displays of affection or sloppy appearances.

General Information about School Crime

There have been a number of studies of school violence and vandalism. Those used in the preparation of this report are cited in the resource section in Volume II. The most extensive to date is the national Safe School Study released to Congress and the public in January, 1978, just before the Illinois task force concluded its work.[2] The national study is based on the responses to elaborate questionnaires by thousands of principals, teachers, and students in communities of all sizes throughout the country. A number of the major findings of the study will be cited in the following pages. In light of the lack of a major survey focusing on Illinois, the results of this study were the best single source of information for the preparation of this report.

The Safe School Study provides information about the extent of violence and crimes against property by community size and type and by grade level. The perceptions of principals regarding the extent of the problem in their schools are a major source of data. There are, however, limitations on the use of such data. Different people will define a similar situation differently. Further, perceptions of the extent of a problem may be based on very inadequate information. Although some schools and districts keep very good information about vandalism, adequate school and district information about violence is generally not available. One reason is that student victims may fear retaliation if they report an assault to the principal. Another is that principals are oriented to protecting the reputation of the school. For these reasons, some school administrators may tend to underestimate the extent of the problem.

Eight percent of the principals surveyed in the Safe School Study defined their school crime situation as a fairly serious or very serious problem. Seventeen percent defined the situation as a moderate problem. For the majority, crime was considered either no problem or a minor one. Principals from junior high schools and from cities over 50,000 in population and in suburban areas were much more likely to perceive crime as fairly or very serious than were elementary school principals or principals in schools outside metropolitan areas.

According to the Safe School Study, elementary schools are much less likely than junior high

schools to experience theft, vandalism, and crimes against persons. The proportion of junior high school students and teachers reporting attacks and robbery was considerably higher than senior high school students or teachers. No significant differences between these two secondary levels were apparent regarding theft or vandalism.

The relationship between the extent of school crime and the size and type of community varies between offenses against property and offenses against persons. For property offenses, according to the Safe School Study, the risks in schools do not differ much throughout a metropolitan area. In fact, vandalism and school theft seem to be somewhat more a suburban than a big city problem. On the other hand, the larger the size of the community, the greater the risk of violence. The risks of offenses are generally less in schools in the smaller communities outside metropolitan areas except that burglary and personal theft are about as prevalent in schools in small places as large places.

These findings are reinforced by the major study in Illinois on youthful (14-18 years of age) misbehavior and crime, which was conducted by the Institute for Juvenile Research.[3] A major limitation of this study for a report on school crime is that it did not have the respondent to the survey indicate the site of his or her action. However, similar patterns emerged in this Illinois study and in the Safe School Study. There was, generally, no significant variation in the proportion of youth indicating they had engaged in varying types of offenses against property by size of community — whether Chicago, Chicago suburbs, or downstate places ranging from over 50,000 to under 2,500 in population. There was, however, a somewhat greater proportion of Chicago suburbanites than youths from other kinds of communities who reported having taken things from home and schools and deliberately damaging property. On the other hand, Chicago had a significantly higher proportion of youths reporting acts of violence (e.g. fist fights, "strong-arming") than small town/rural places.

The foregoing information suggests which schools in what kinds of communities in Illinois are likely to have at least a moderate problem of crime. Therefore, it suggests where efforts should be made to gather more specific information about school crime as the first step in systematically developing programs to alleviate it.

The Settings and Costs

In order to analyze the nature and extent of the problem in a district or a school, it is important to gather information on such factors as where offenses tend to occur, when they tend to occur, and the costs, as well as information on the committers of crime and the victims of it. The use of the various national and state reports cited in this chapter and in the resource section of Volume II should aid school personnel in understanding and dealing with the type of crime in their locality. However, there is no substitute for systematically gathering and analyzing information on a district-wide and school basis.

According to several studies, high-risk locations for crime may include the cafeteria, rest rooms, hallways or stairs, gym or lockers, and classrooms — although considering the amount of time spent in classrooms, they are relatively safe places.

Any local analysis of school crime against property must determine the kinds of property vandalized or stolen. If patterns are discernible, then appropriate preventative or "target hardening" measures can be taken. Types of vandalism include glass breakage (the most common in most districts), campus/playground destruction, exterior and interior surface defacement (e.g. graffiti), structural damage and equipment damage as well as vandalism in buses and other vehicles and damage to instructional supplies.

Another type of vital planning and management information is the time offenses tend to occur — time of day, during the week or weekend, time of year. According to several studies, including one in New Jersey, weekend vandalism was found to outweigh occurrences of vandalism at other times. School day vandalism and that associated with evening extra-curricular events ranked fourth and fifth behind holidays and vacations.[4]

A number of efforts have been made in recent years to determine the cost of school crime. Most school district studies on costs have focused on vandalism. Costs to schools of property crime include the repairs and replacement less any recovery from insurance and from the offender; security personnel and hardware, if any; and the time taken up by maintenance and administrative staff. Although arson is not common and most deliberately set fires cause only minor damage, a district's per-pupil property damage costs will soar for the year on those rare occasions when a district experiences a major school fire.

Authorities on the subject estimate that in the average school in the past few years, the annual cost of crime including property replacement and security equipment and personnel is at least $11 per pupil (this figure does not include the costs to individuals of theft or injury). Per-student costs tend to be higher in larger urban districts and lower for the small town/rural districts where some kinds of crime are less frequent and where districts are less likely to have incurred the cost of security measures.

Although there are no state-wide data in Illinois, there is information on vandalism for suburban Cook County schools. According to surveys, the cost of vandalism in those schools (excluding security measures and arson) for the 1975-76 school year was $782,524.36. The enrollment for that year

was 447,580. When accidental damage (excluding accidental fires) is added in, the cost to schools rises to $910,599.58. This figure is lower, however, than a comparable figure for 1973-74 of $1,135,552.[3]

Offenders and Victims

Information about offenders and victims are needed in any school or district effort to analyze school crime and to develop appropriate crime reduction measures. The following are some key questions. Are there patterns in regard to the age, sex and socio-economic background of the students — both victims and offenders? Do certain categories of teachers tend to be victims? What are the academic records and placements of student offenders, and what is their behavior record (e.g. in elementary school, truancy, suspension, drug or alcohol use)? Are parents ever offenders? To what extent are offenders "intruders," people who are not students in the school? Do intruders tend to be ex-students (dropout or suspended), students from other schools, or persons with no particular connection to the local schools?

In response to some of these questions, the following are presented as generalizations based on national and state studies. Whether they apply to any given school or district is a matter for local study.

According to survey data from the Institute of Juvenile Research of the Illinois Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, males are more likely to engage in violent acts than females; and adolescents of lower socio-economic background are more likely to engage in them than those of higher socio-economic background. The more serious the offense, the fewer the proportion of youths reporting having engaged in it.

Property crime, however, is generally spread more or less evenly across the standard demographic categories of family socio-economic background, race, sex and size of community.

Evidence from several reports indicates that student offenders tend to be those with lower grades in lower tracks, students with a history of minor behavioral problems often going back to early elementary school, and those with records of truancy, suspension, and expulsion. The Safe School Study data suggest that the violent students are most likely to be those who have given up on school, who do not care about grades and find the courses irrelevant. Also according to the Safe School Study, the great majority of all reported offenses were committed by students currently in the school. With the exception of burglary and trespassing, offenders tended not to be intruders.

Data on students as victims of crime has been gathered in a 1977 Youth Survey by the Gallup Organization. Over 1,000 randomly selected teenagers (13-18 years old) were asked the following questions:

When you are at school, do you ever fear for your physical safety? (percentages are "yes" response to the question)

National - 18%; boys - 15%, girls - 21%; white - 16%, non-whites - 26%; 13-15 years - 22%, 16-18 years - 14%.

During the last twelve months have any of the following happened to you at school?

Been physically assaulted: National - 4%; boys - 6%, girls - 2%; whites - 4%, non-whites - 7%; 13-15 - 4%, 16-18 - 5%.

Had money stolen: National - 12%; boys - 10%, girls - 13%; whites - 11%, non-whites - 16%; 13-15 - 10%, 16-18 - 14%.

Had property damaged/destroyed: National - 11%; boys - 13%, girls - 9%; white - 10%, non-whites - 15%; 13-15 - 10%, 16-18 - 12%.

Although teachers are less likely to be attacked than students, according to the Safe School Study, they are about as likely to have been robbed or had something stolen.[4] For teachers and junior and senior high school students, the study estimates that risk in a typical school month as follows:

	Teachers	*Secondary Students*
Victim of theft	1 in 8	1 in 9
Been robbed	1 in 167	1 in 200
Physically attacked	1 in 200	1 in 80

Additional information on teachers as victims of student crime and misbehavior is provided in a recent survey pinpointing sources of stress for Chicago teachers. This survey of Chicago teachers was carried out as a cooperative venture of the Chicago Teachers Union, the School of Public Health of the University of Illinois, and Roosevelt University. Thirty-six events were identified as stressful. Of the 11 most stressful events, four fell within the category of violence and student discipline. These four were managing "disruptive" children (the second most stressful event), threatened with personal injury (the 4th), colleague assaulted in school (the 7th), and target of verbal abuse by student (the 11th).

Causes and Trends

Although general causes of violence and vandalism are often hard to identify, any thorough analysis of youthful crime in school and community must involve some assessment of the causes. While causes stemming from community factors and societal problems are to a considerable extent beyond the direct influence of schools, schools can do something to alleviate the problem to the extent that the causes stem from school policies, practices, and programs.

Frequently cited factors are a tradition of youth pranks and rowdyism, difficult emotional and adjustment problems, boredom and frustration with schoolwork, hostility toward school personnel, lack

of pride in the school, casual and capricious behavior, and family, community and employment instability. One matter getting particular attention recently is the possible link between learning disabilities and the development of delinquent behavior patterns.

Inasmuch as evidence from a variety of sources suggests a considerable escalation of school crime between the late 1950's and the early and middle 1970's,[2] some causes of school crime are to be found in recent trends. Cited as explanations for the escalation in community and school violence and vandalism since the 1950's are the increased availability and use of drugs, alcohol and guns; the exposure to violence and other crimes, often glorified, by television; increased resentment of a history of racial discrimination; and the rapid increase in the numbers of junior high and senior high school students (a particularly crime-prone age group). Other explanations include the increasing dissatisfaction of students with their traditional subordinate and passive role in schools, and insufficient employment and other alternatives to formal schooling for older teenagers not oriented to or successful at traditional high school academic work and social activities.

This chapter in the task force report has focused on the nature and extent of school violence and vandalism. It has indicated that crime in the schools is much more a problem at the secondary level than the elementary level, that violence is more a problem at the junior high level than the senior high level, and that there is not much difference between these two levels in regard to vandalism and other offenses against property. In general the larger the community, the more likely schools are to have a problem with violence. However, size of community often does not make much difference in regard to the amount of property crime in schools, although vandalism and school theft tend to be more of a problem in suburbia than elsewhere. This chapter has also set forth some generalizations about the causes, setting, cost, committers, and victims of school crime. These kinds of information gathered at the district and school level are important as schools and school districts plan and manage programs to help alleviate the problem.

---

1. Robbery refers to taking something by force, weapon or threats, including extortion and shakedowns; personal theft is defined as stealing something from an individual without force or threat of force.

2. **Violent Schools — Safe Schools: The Safe School Study Report to the Congress.** U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., January, 1978. Also see the "Executive Summary," National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., December, 1977.

3. "Summary and Policy Implications of the Youth and Society in Illinois Reports," Institute for Juvenile Research, Illinois Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, pages 60-86. For full citation, see resource section of the manual under Youth and Society in Illinois Reports.

4. New Jersey School Board Association, **Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study School Vandalism,** Trenton, New Jersey, 1976.

5. Educational Service Region of Cook County, "Suburban Cook County School Districts Vandalism Survey and Report," 1974, and ESR of Cook County, new release March 3, 1977.

6. About one-fifth of the reported thefts from students involved money or property worth more than $10.

7. According to the Safe School Study, crime in schools has not become more severe since the middle 1970's. A few principals reported that the situation in their school has become worse in the past several years; others (often big city principals) say the situation has improved.

CHAPTER TWO

Summary of Some Local Approaches to Deal with School Violence and Vandalism

This chapter summarizes some local approaches for dealing with the problem of school violence and vandalism. The companion volume to this report presents a more detailed discussion of these approaches under four headings: educational programs and student involvement; involving the community, parents and police; legal alternatives; and design and security measures.

Professional Training

One of the major conclusions of the Safe School Study indicates the need for better training for some building administrators. The study underscored the importance of a firm, fair and consistent system for running a school: "Where rules are known, and where they are firmly and fairly enforced, less violence occurs."[1] School systems which have a serious problem with violence and vandalism need to take a hard look at the abilities and leadership characteristics of principals in troubled schools.

Districts' personnel should discuss the need for more and better training not only for building administrators, but also for teachers and other professional personnel—training in effective disciplinary strategies, in dealing with personal stress caused by student misbehavior and crime, in conflict management and crisis intervention, in understanding adolescent development, and in developing better rapport with students.

In-service training may help teachers deal with the frustration some of them feel in coping with student misbehavior as well as violence. There must be widespread recognition that teachers and students are victims of violence in school. There also must be recognition of the psychological drain and loss of attention to educational matters that accompany violence and vandalism.[2] Therefore, current efforts in Illinois to help teachers deal with on-the-job stress represent one necessary direction for in-service training in some districts.

Reporting Forms

Districts should consider implementing the use of detailed and uniform reporting forms for collecting data on incidences of school violence and vandalism. There are two distinct purposes for systematically recording data about school crime. One is to gather information for planning preventive programs and deferrence measures. Such planning should be based on information about where and when the different kinds of offenses tend to occur and the costs as well as information on the committers of crime and the victims of it.

A reporting form designed for planning purposes may also be used, perhaps somewhat modified, for a second purpose — to provide information to authorities to take action against an offender. If districts intend to use legal processes, gathering detailed and accurate information on offenses is a vital first step.

Alternative Education

Alternative education programs provide options for students who would in the absence of such programs be suspended from school for violations of regulations, including acts of violence and vandalism. The objective of such programs is to help the youngster resolve the difficulties which lead to the disruptive behavior in school and to return eventually to the regular classroom setting.

A small number of students will probably not return to the regular classroom. Such students — and not just disruptive ones — are unresponsive to or unsuccessful at conventional schooling. In small off-campus settings, they can pursue learning in a manner attuned to their particular needs.

However, it is vital that alternatives in educational programming be well-planned preventive types of programs and not a reaction to crisis situations or a "dumping ground" for disruptive students. Alternatives should help students develop self-discipline as a substitute for discipline imposed by the school.

Responsibility Education

Responsibility education, as defined by the Illinois Office of Education, involves educational programs designed to develop responsible citizenship. Like alternative education, responsibility education has relevance to curtailing student misbehavior and the more serious violence and vandalism. Both programs, more than most, emphasize the active participation of the learner. Responsibility education includes assistance in clarifying personal values and goals, along with the study of personal legal responsibilities — important elements in a delinquency prevention curriculum. Although a dose of responsibility education can not be prescribed like a pill to cure the misbehaving student, a diligent effort to apply the concepts and approaches associated with responsibility education should help encourage attitudes that discourage participation in school and community crime. Inherent in the concept of responsibility education is student participation in the design of school rules and penalties for their violation.

Law-related education includes the use of lawyers, judges, probation and police officers as classroom and field resources to talk about their jobs, the possible consequences of acts of crime, and alternatives to violence and vandalism as a way of dealing with problems. Student interest and sense of responsibility can be stimulated through case studies involving young people as committers, victims and witnesses of crime in a school setting and elsewhere.

Community Education

Curbing school violence and vandalism may be one reason for a school district to establish or develop further programs that keep schools open, lighted and occupied in evenings, weekends and the summer. Another community education approach is the housing in a school building of the offices of a variety of social service agencies to help coordinate efforts designed to help delinquency-prone youth and their families. A third approach is for schools to support the work of interagency community councils, conferences and workshops that focus on community violence and vandalism and related subjects.

Most authorities on the subject of crime prevention and the schools agree on the importance of community-based problem solving and interagency cooperation between educators, juvenile justice personnel and youth-serving social service agencies designed to help youth in trouble. Therefore, schools can learn from, contribute to, and collaborate with a variety of community agencies and groups.

School/Police Relationships

Of all the community agencies and groups with which schools should have good and well-defined relations in regard to school crime and other disruptions, none are more important than law enforcement agencies. Because the reporting of crime is a key link between schools and the police, it is important for school and district administrators to develop or reassess periodically their policies on reporting school crime to the police.

The program involving the most extensive degree of cooperation between the schools and the police is the use of a police officer in one or more school buildings. Stationing the police in the school may have security as its major purpose. However, advocates of "police-school liaison programs" emphasize the educational and counseling aspects of such programs. One way in which schools may find local law enforcement agencies to be of specific help is in drawing on their technical knowledge of crime prevention and security measures.

Parental Involvement

Almost all commentators cite parents as very important sources of youthful attitudes and behavior. Data from the Safe School Study indicate that schools suffering relatively little property loss through vandalism tend to be schools having a relatively high proportion of students from families in which both parents are present and in which discipline is firm.

Schools should consider offering classes for parents in dealing with problems of children and adolescents — including those problems with origins in the home that may be manifested in school and community violence and vandalism. Using parents as security guards and monitors on evenings and weekends is one way of trying to curtail school crime through parental awareness, support and action.

Security and Design Measures

Over the last decade numerous publications have appeared on the subject of physical design measures and security measures school districts can take to reduce property damage and create a safer environment. Attention to design factors of school property, especially during new construction and/or remodeling of older facilities, can reduce the likelihood of damage due to vandalism. In developing its own security measures, a district should review the variety of approaches — both hardware and personnel — which have been used; but it should also analyze its own situation and tailor its measures to its particular problems.

The people most frequently used for security purposes are school administrators and teachers. Other examples include the use of janitors, police on regular patrol outside the school, security guards employed by the school, students as monitors, police officers stationed in schools, and parents as monitors or security guards.

Districts will find that the costs of certain measures in certain schools simply are not cost effective. Others may be considered too suggestive of an "armed camp," and inappropriate to the purposes and values of education. Still, districts have an obligation to protect people and property even as they work to develop educational and student and community involvement programs designed to alleviate the need for "target hardening."

Legal Processes

Illinois' *Parental Responsibility Law* and local ordinances based upon this law provide a civil remedy to school districts, teachers and students who suffer property damage or physical injury because of willful or malicious acts of minors. Under this law a parent does not have to be proven guilty of negligence in order to be held financially responsible (up to $500) for damages caused by the willful and malicious acts of the child. If a district decides to pursue suits based on this law, it is recommended that notice of intent to use this law be publicized. When a decision to take legal action in a particular case is announced, presumably some restitution can be obtained by preliminary letters to the parents without the necessity of actually filing the lawsuits.

Although the *Juvenile Court Act* greatly limits the prosecution of minors under the criminal laws of Illinois, a minor who has violated or attempted to violate any federal or state law or municipal ordinance can be adjudicated a delinquent minor. If a district's overall policy is to hold minors legally responsible for their acts of violence and vandalism, a school district needs to work with the state's attorney to obtain prosecution for criminal offenses. Where probation and restitution are agreed upon or otherwise ordered, a minor will have no criminal record.

School people may want to explore with judges and the State's Attorney their mutual roles and responsibilities. It should be pointed out that while principals generally feel that they receive adequate support from central administrators, the school board, the police and parents in handling discipline problems, they give courts very low ratings in this regard, according to the Safe School Study.

---

1. "Violent Schools — Safe Schools. The Safe School Study Report to the Congress — Executive Summary." The National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., December, 1977, page 5.

2. "The Battered Teacher," Alford M. Block, M.D., **Today's Education,** March-April, 1977, pages 58-62.

CHAPTER THREE

Recommendations for State-Level Consideration

Although most of the initiative and responsibility for curbing violence and vandalism should come from the local district and community level, one of the purposes of the task force was to suggest potential roles for consideration by the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Education, and the Illinois Office of Education. The following recommendations are presented by the task force for consideration in light of over-all state-level priorities, the availability of funds and personnel and the extent of local needs for outside assistance.

Presented first are general recommendations for possible state-level action developed by the task force and by the United States Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, which has made the major effort at the federal level to define an appropriate state-level role. Following these two lists and based in part upon them are a number of somewhat more specific task force recommendations that build upon existing Illinois organizations and programs and reflect the interests and concerns of task force members. Finally, the task force suggests the outline of comprehensive legislation to help local districts curtail school violence and vandalism.

Task Force General Recommendations

The task force has identified the following as appropriate state-level roles:

1. Identification of state, federal and private sector resource people and organizations as well as articles, studies and other publications for local districts to draw upon.
2. Sponsorship of workshops both to promote greater awareness and to provide information on how to handle the various problems associated with violence and vandalism.
3. Development of booklets on design and security measures.
4. Recommendation of ways by which local districts can develop new and more effective relationships with the law enforcement/criminal justice system and with social services agencies.
5. Identification of various programs throughout the state and from other states and the development of an IOE information clearinghouse and/or booklets with information on a variety of workable and model practices.
6. Identification of existing funding sources and help in developing new sources.
7. Conducting research on specific problems in Illinois.

Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency Recommendations

Another list of recommendations for state-level action is presented in the final report in 1977 on the nature and prevention of school violence and vandalism by the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary. These recommendations follow:

1. Establish a state advisory committee to assist local school boards in formulating anti-violence and anti-vandalism programs.
2. Hold regional meetings throughout the state to discuss problems and solicit suggestions.
3. Publish a booklet of model codes of rights and responsibilities.
4. Recommend necessary legislation on school violence and vandalism to the Governor and legislature.
5. Encourage state teacher training institutions to establish courses in effective disciplinary techniques for both in-service and pre-service teachers.
6. Establish minimum standards for school security personnel.
7. Establish a uniform statewide violence and vandalism reporting system.

8. Establish a special committee within the State Education Agency to study long range solutions for problems unique to that state.
9. Make recommendations to the Governor and legislature to insure authorization and resources for alternative and community schools, reasonable class loads, school security personnel programs and various other violence reduction strategies.

Additional and More Specific Task Force Recommendations for State Level Consideration

1. Explore with the major educational interest groups in the state the feasibility and desirability of jointly sponsoring and funding for Illinois a study along the lines of the national Safe School Study.
2. Have IOE staff inform district people of this report and encourage districts to determine whether there is a need to develop task forces to study and analyze the local situation.
3. Encourage Regional Superintendents to consider conducting surveys of schools in their region to determine the extent, type and cost of vandalism, to disseminate the results and to sponsor workshops on the subject of alleviating violence and vandalism.
4. Allocate to appropriate staff members and units in the IOE information and technical assistance functions regarding federal, state and private organization assistance to local districts relating to preventing school crime and to related problems. Such functions would include collecting, maintaining, updating and disseminating to local districts information about school and school-related program emphasis, regulations, and currently funded projects in Illinois of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, the U.S. Office of Education and other state and federal agencies as well as of private agencies. Additional functions could include information about the availability of technical assistance, training, research and evaluation results on the effectiveness of programs.
5. Have IOE staff assess the feasibility and desirability of recommending to the General Assembly one or the other of the following to allow the funding of the cost of vandalism, arson and other school disruptions and of security measures: (1) The revising of Article 17-2.11 (Tax for fire prevention and safety purposes) and Article 17-2.11a (School Board power to borrow money and issue bonds for alterations for fire prevention and safety purposes); or (2) the development of a new article.
6. Consider conducting a study on school building specifications and security design standards with the purpose that such findings be taken into account in planning for all new construction and in remodeling. In addition, consideration should be given to incorporating such findings into *Building Specifications for Health and Safety in Public Schools,* Circular Series A-157, and *Efficient and Adequate Standards for the Construction of Schools,* Circular Series A-156.
7. Consider exploring with the Capital Development Board a joint project for the construction of a model school facility to incorporate proven security design standards as well as energy conservation designs. Such a project should serve as a working model and standard for future school construction and design.
8. Develop, in cooperation with school districts and law enforcement agencies, standard forms for local districts to record information about each incident of vandalism and violence for (1) planning and program development purposes and (2) reporting to law enforcement agencies.
9. Revise the IOE handbook, "Students and Schools — Rights and Responsibilities" to include a description of the criminal and civil law to which students are subject.
10. Consider asking teacher training institutions to demonstrate, in approved programs, course work in effective disciplinary techniques and in the applicable laws (i.e., *The School Code of Illinois,* civil and criminal laws as they apply to juveniles).
11. Sponsor in-service training for teachers and administrators dealing with methods of handling disruptions, and legal alternatives to deal with violence and vandalism.
12. Have staff identify alternative programs that effectively deal with disruption-prone students and, building on this information, develop in-service training programs, statewide workshops, and cooperative arrangements with university programs training teachers and administrators.
13. Develop further and expand the Responsibility Education Network.
14. Encourage the Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers to stimulate its various units to discuss violence and vandalism, assess the extent and nature of the problem locally, evaluate the measures already taken and, working with other local groups and school people, recommend additional educational and security measures, if necessary.
15. Use appropriate advisory councils as forums to address the topics and recommendations of this report.

Comprehensive Legislation

If solid evidence accumulates that statewide and in a number of districts and service regions the incidence and per-pupil cost of school violence and vandalism is a significant burden on budgets and the learning environments, then the task force recommends that the State Board of Education endorse legislation to authorize funding for various violence and vandalism reduction programs. Such programs would include the following; (1) preventive facility design; (2) support for security measures — both hardware and security people; (3) alternative programs to provide options to traditional schooling for disruption-prone students; (4) creative approaches in curriculum development, teaching methods and counseling techniques; (5) police/school liaison and other community/school programs; and (6) training for school staff in legal processes and disciplinary techniques. Eligible for funding would be districts documenting a need, and submitting a viable plan which includes the use of community resources.

TASK FORCE MEMBERS AND ILLINOIS OFFICE OF EDUCATION STAFF

TASK FORCE ON SCHOOL VIOLENCE AND VANDALISM MEMBERS

Dale E. Kaiser
Task Force Chairperson
Department of Educational Leadership
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale

Nikki Baker
Student Advisory Committee to
State Board of Education
Southeast High School
Springfield

Marshall Berner
Superintendent — District 4
Champaign

Robert Boyd
Director
Pupil Personnel Services
School District U-46
Elgin

Edward D. Brady
Director
Plant Security
Chicago Board of Education
Chicago

Angela Christmas
Chicago Program Center
Department of Corrections
School District 428
Chicago

Tom Corcoran
Coordinator — Law/Justice Education
Center for Urban Education
Chicago Board of Education
Chicago

Francis Cronin
Director — Maintenance and Rehabilitation
Chicago Board of Education
Chicago

Michael Ducey
Institute of Juvenile Research
Illinois Department of Mental Health and
Developmental Disabilities
Chicago

Donna Edelen
Board Member
Suburban Southern Christian Leadership
Conference
Arlington Heights

David Sly
Director of Business Affairs
School District 205
Harvey

John Kotsakis
Chairperson
School Discipline Committee and
Field Representative
Chicago Teachers Union
Chicago

Mary Leon
Juvenile Protection Chairperson
Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers
Chicago

Gretchen McDowell
President, Morgan Park High School PTA
Chicago

Ronald L. McIntire
Principal — District 2
Raymond

Samuel Morgan
Principal — District 189
East St. Louis

Tom Morgan
Vice-President
Rockford Education Association
Rockford

Martha O'Malley
Regional Superintendent of Schools
St. Clair County
Educational Service Region
Belleville

Peter M. Omarzu
Student Advisory Committee to
State Board of Education
Maine South High School
Park Ridge

Vista Quaini
Illinois Federation of Teachers
School District 89
Maywood

Nancy Quisenberry
Associate Dean — College of Education
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale

Gloria Richardson
Juvenile Justice Division
Illinois Law Enforcement Commission
Chicago

Ronald Steigerwald
Dean of Students
Forest View High School
Arlington Heights

Paul Thurston
Department of Administration,
Higher and Continuing Education
University of Illinois
Urbana

Thomas E. Van Dam
Superintendent — District 151
South Holland

Richard Wisner
Illinois Association of School Boards
Springfield

ILLINOIS OFFICE OF EDUCATION STAFF ASSIGNED TO TASK FORCE

David Scott
Staff Coordinator and Author
Senior Policy Analyst
Department of Planning and Research

Fay Hartog-Rapp
Assistant Legal Advisor
Legal Department

William Humm
Research Scientist
Department of Planning and Research

Jim Johnson
School Evaluation Specialist
Department of Recognition and Supervision

Bill McClard
Educational Consultant
Responsibility Education/Educational Alternatives
Department of Local Education Agency Services

Jennifer Raney
Energy Specialist
School District Organization and Facilities Section
Department of Planning and Research

Glen Rubenking
State School Architect
School District Organization and Facilities Section
Department of Planning and Research

Emmett Slingsby
Illinois Resource and Dissemination Network
Department of Local Education Agency Services

Carolyn Wilson
Student Affairs Specialist
Department of Governmental and Community Relations